DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 306 796 HE 022 457

AUTHOR Cowart, Vinette
TITLE Student Financial Assistance in the Arizona Public Universities.
INSTITUTION Arizona Board of Regents, Phoenix.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 22p.; In "The Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency, and Competitiveness. Final Report and Working Papers." Volume One. For Volumes One and Two, see HE 022 446-447. For individual working papers, see HE 022 448-480 and HE 022 482-501.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; Access to Education; College Students; Community Influence; Competition; Demography; Educational Quality; Efficiency; Excellence in Education; Federal Aid; Grants; Higher Education; Minority Groups; Need Analysis (Student Financial Aid); Public Colleges; Scholarships; Socioeconomic Influences; State Aid; *State Universities; *Student Financial Aid; Student Loan Programs; Tuition; Work Study Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; Arizona State University; Arizona Task Force on Excellence Efficiency Compet; Northern Arizona University; University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

Information on student financial assistance at Arizona's three public universities is presented as one working paper in the final report of the Arizona Board of Regents' (ABOR) Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. Statistics are provided on the following: students; distribution of financial aid; federal financial aid; state financial aid; other states' plans; potential barriers to a university education (minority and socioeconomic considerations, and demographics); environmental influences of community; financial aid application; financial aid offices; indebtedness (loans); and financial aspects of persistence. Presently, Arizona's financial aid system works best for those who make effective contact with the university structure. Recommendations include: the state should develop a financial assistance program for resident students with financial need in which loan indebtedness is kept to a minimum; institutions should actively seek additional private funding for scholarships; and the ABOR should continue its tuition/fee waiver program. An appendix discusses types of aid (College Work-Study Program, loans for parents, Native American grants, Carl D. Perkins National Direct Student Loan, Pell Grants, private scholarships, regents' tuition/fee waivers, Stafford Student Loans, State Student Incentive Grant, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, supplemental loans for students, and a tuition set aside program. Contains 47 references and 5 tables. (SM)

ED 306 796

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE IN THE ARIZONA PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AZ Board of Regents

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

VINETTE COWART

In 1986-87, Arizona postsecondary educational institutions distributed $289,088,907 in student financial assistance. Almost half of this aid, $144,800,223 was administered by the three public universities in the state (ACPE). Nearly two-thirds of university aid was in the form of loans and student employment, commonly called self-help aid. Gift aid (scholarships and grants) comprised the remaining third. (Table 1)

Students who have qualified for financial assistance may receive a "package" of awards consisting of a grant, a loan, and a college work-study position--three awards. Other students may qualify for only a loan, thus receiving one financial aid award. Scholarships and tuition/fee waivers are awarded on the basis of need, ability, or faculty/staff/dependent status. Students employed on campus and graduate assistants are also included in institutional financial assistance calculations.

Vinette Cowart is a graduate research associate at Arizona State University working on a PhD in Higher Education. Prior to coming to ASU in 1986, she was Program Coordinator of minority programs in the College of Engineering at the University of Alabama in Birmingham and Assistant Director of Admissions and Acting Director of Enrollment Management at Oregon Institute of Technology. Since beginning her doctoral work at ASU, she has worked with the College of Education and the Hispanic Mother Daughter Program. She also holds certification as a rehabilitation counselor and as an elementary teacher.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Comparisons among the universities are further complicated by the fact that data are reported by number of awards more often than by number of recipients. Thus, caution is suggested in drawing conclusions about recipients of financial aid from the data presented. General trends, however, can be inferred.

STUDENTS

Financial aid awards appear to be distributed equally among male (49%) and female (51%) students at the three universities. Using the Fall 1986 headcount at ASU and NAU (UA data are not comparable) we can determine an approximate distribution of financial aid by ethnicity. Financial aid was distributed to 75.5 percent of the Black students and 65 percent of the Hispanic students. Fifty percent of the Asian students at ASU received aid while 90 percent of the Asians at NAU did. Reasons for this wide variation are unknown. All American Indian students received aid due mainly to Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) tribal funds. Non-minorities receiving aid ranged from a low of 41 percent of the enrollment at ASU to a high of 52 percent at NAU. It appears that minority students are more heavily dependent upon financial aid than non-minority students. No data were available regarding the number of non-resident students who receive financial aid (Table 2).

HE 022 457

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISTRIBUTION OF FINANCIAL AID

Minority students at the three universities receive about one quarter of the scholarships and grants. The notable exception to this is the American Indian students at NAU who receive nearly half of the grant funds distributed due to BIA funding. Minorities receive approximately 17 percent of the loan and employment monies. This means that minorities rely more heavily on gift aid, largely due to targeted aid, and non-minorities rely to a greater extent on self-help aid. This trend was especially evident in the 1970's when targeted aid was more abundant.

Respondents to the American College Testing Program's alumni survey of 1981 graduates of the Arizona universities reported that educational grants had been a major or minor source of funding for 49 percent of the minority alumni compared to 20 percent of the non-minority alumni. Scholarships were a major or minor source for 48 percent of the minorities and 27 percent of the non-minorities. Parents or relatives provided 72 percent of the non-minorities with the major or minor portion of their college costs as compared to 54% of the minorities. Loans, employment, and personal savings were about the same for all groups (Church, 1988).

From a recent survey conducted at the three universities of 402 undergraduate, full-time students, there appears to be a greater dependence on a combination of loans, grants, and employment. However, the majority of students still depend most heavily on parents and family for their financial support. Black and Hispanic students classified financial problems as the main problem facing minority students at the universities. For American Indian and Asian students, financial difficulties ranked as the second most significant problem, after academic and social issues, respectively (Cotera, 1988).

FEDERAL FINANCIAL AID

Federal aid increased by 39.8 percent between 1980 and 1987, from $10.4 billion to $14.5 billion. However, when calculated in constant 1982 dollars, the federal aid increase was only 8.8 percent (College Board, 1988). During this time Pell Grant recipients declined by 3.3 percent, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOG) by 3.9 percent, and College Work Study (CWS) by 8.1 percent. Stafford (Guaranteed/GSL) Student Loans went to 20 percent more students while state grants and State Student Incentive Grants (SSIG) recipients increased by 41 percent (Appendix). Computed in 1982 constant dollars, federal financial aid awards, whether grant or loan, decreased by an average of 15 percent. Only the Pell Grants kept pace with inflation; however, 89,000 fewer students received the grants (College Board, 1988).

In the mid-1970's, loans comprised only one fifth of all federal student financial aid. By 1986-87, loans were nearly half of all the aid distributed nationally. Clearly, minority as well as non-minority students must rely heavily on the federal loan programs and employment to fund their education, although minorities to a slightly lesser degree than non-minorities.

STATE FINANCIAL AID

These actions by the federal government have placed a greater burden on the states to increase their financial aid programs. In Arizona the estimated total State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG)

awarded in 1987-88 was $3,254,000. This ranks Arizona in the bottom third of the states in terms of directly appropriated state funds for student aid.(NASSGP, 1988) When compared with five states with similar populations, tax funds, and state appropriations to higher education, Arizona ranks last except in the categories of number of undergraduates and funds for higher education (Table 3).

However, the Arizona Board of Regents has provided a very generous tuition/fee waiver program that is not reflected in calculations of directly appropriated funds. Of the institutions in the western athletic conferences who responded to a recent EEC Task Force survey, regardless of student enrollment and expenditure authority, the three Arizona universities had the largest tuition/fee waiver program (Table 4).

The Regents' waivers are awarded on the basis of academic ability, talent, need, or faculty/staff/dependent status. They are awarded to community college transfers, minority students, single students with dependents, and the top 10 percent of each graduating high school class in the state of Arizona. At least 50 percent of these waivers must be awarded on the basis of documented financial need. Also, the ABOR has set automatic increases in the numbers of waivers based on enrollment growth. Between 26 to 39 percent of other institutional funds are awarded in categories which include targeted ethnic groups. An average of 16 percent of institutional funds are used for athletic scholarships (Table 5).

In the spring of 1988, the Arizona Board of Regents proposed the Arizona Financial Aid Trust. This proposal sought $1,000,000 from the legislature to match $1,000,000 from student contributions. Half of this $2,000,000 was to be used for grant aid to undergraduate state residents while the other half of the principal and all of the interest was to be endowed for future aid. These grant funds were to be directed toward students with financial need, minority students, and the educationally disadvantaged. This proposal was not approved by the legislature.

OTHER STATES' PLANS

The Madison Plan of the University of Wisconsin-Madison uses institutional gift funds to finance the FASTrack program. FASTrack is for financially dependent, low income Wisconsin residents. Students entering the program are assured that their financial need will be fully met for four to five years. A combination of grants and work finance the freshman year. A loan, limited to $800 per year, is added to the financial aid package after the freshman year. This plan has several notable merits: first, the students incur no debt during the freshman year; second, they are assured they will be financially able to complete college; third, the program uses the positive retention aspects of work to help the student adjust to campus; and fourth, the student knows repayment will be no more than $35 per month for ten years after he/she leaves school.

Another aspect of the Madison Plan is the coordination through one office of all merit scholarships, whether university-wide or college/school specific. This highly visible program provides more information for students, prospective scholars, and donors (UWM, 1988).

Because costs of higher education continue to outpace the rate of inflation,

forty states are currently considering state-assisted savings and credit plans to help parents pay for their children's education. The federal government is also looking at college savings plans. Plans vary from prepayment of a set tuition fee for a particular college to the proposed use of U.S. Savings Bonds as College Savings Bonds. Both the existing state and proposed federal plans are struggling with issues regarding the rate of return on the investment, tax liabilities, and administrative costs. The proposed federal programs have one advantage over the individual state programs in that they do not restrict interstate attendance. It is generally believed that these plans will be used by the upper-middle class and upper-class, those that can afford to save money for a college education. Programs such as these will have little impact on lower-income families; this segment of Arizona's population is most at risk.

POTENTIAL BARRIERS TO A UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

MINORITY CONSIDERATIONS

Minority groups who are under-represented in education are disproportionately from the lower income stratum, from families with limited exposure to formal education, and from environments where the benefits of education are not much in evidence.

Richardson (1988) has identified three categories of minority students at American universities. One group consists of second or third generation middle class students whose parents are college graduates, are well-prepared academically, and have a commitment to education. This group's access is essentially the same as non-minority middle class students. A second group is composed of first generation, upwardly mobile students who have a strong belief in education but whose academic preparation is inadequate. These students do not have family or friends who understand the higher education system. The third group are also first generation college students with insufficient academic preparation; however, they are uncertain of the rewards of education. They generally attend college after military service or in connection with their employment.

Ogbu (1988) describes two types of minorities, the immigrant and the involuntary. The immigrant minorities come to the new country expecting their life to be better. They generally do well because they are goal oriented and have primary cultural differences. Ogbu defines primary cultural differences as:

> ...cultural differences which existed prior to their emigration. [that] enable the immigrants to perceive and respond to cognitive and other differences they encounter as barriers to be overcome without fear of losing their own cultural identity. (Ogbu, 1988)

Blacks, American Indians, and Mexican Americans are examples of involuntary minorities. They were brought to the United States against their will or through conquest. They have experienced generations of limited participation in society due to economic, social, and political barriers. Involuntary minorities have secondary cultural differences. These differences evolved after being incorporated into society and "affect how they respond to the cognitive, linguistic, and cultural differences they encounter in school or test situations." (Ogbu, 1988)

SOCIOECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS

For students from low socioeconomic backgrounds, regardless of race or ethnicity, higher education is for the most part inaccessible, financially, academically, and culturally. Using data from the national survey, High School and Beyond, Valerie Lee (1987) studied access to higher education by both minorities and low socioeconomic status Whites and found that the decision to attend college is strongly influenced by a student's socioeconomic status. Such parameters as low socioeconomic status, being a minority, especially a Hispanic of Mexican origin, having only average academic ability, and being female were found to be negatively related to college attendance and persistence. In 1980, approximately one fourth of Arizona's population had an annual income of less than $10,000. Of this group, 69.5 percent, or 114,170, were non-minorities (Bartrum,1988).

Low socioeconomic status has a profound influence on access to higher education. The cost of living has increased in the United States by 87 percent in the last decade while the cost of attending a public college has risen 114 percent (Shearer, 1988). It is anticipated that tuition may continue to increase from two to three percent per year above inflation. Between the academic years of 1981-82 and 1986-87, the average increase in financial aid for Arizona university students was 19 percent. In the same period tuition increased 51 percent, registration fees increased 84 percent, and the total resident and non-resident costs of education increased 58 percent.

The cost of education is estimated by financial aid offices in determining financial need and amount of aid. The cost of education includes registration fees, room and board, transportation, and incidentals. In 1986-87, the average resident cost of living for the Arizona public universities was $6,771. The average aid received by students was $3,217 (of which $2,500 was loans), or slightly less than half of the estimated cost.

According to the 1980 Census, the median family income in Arizona for whites and Asians was approximately $20,000. For Hispanics the median was slightly less than $16,000, for Blacks about $14,000, and for Native Americans a little more than $10,000. (More recent estimates have placed the median household income of all Arizonans at $29,473, with Hispanics at $21,246.) The average estimated family income of freshmen entering American higher education today is between $35,000 and $40,000 (Astin, 1987). The median family income for full-time Arizona undergraduates in our universities is approximately $39,500. Most students from this average-family-income bracket will have financial need and will be eligible for financial assistance at our universities. Clearly, financial concerns have a profound influence on access to a university education.

DEMOGRAPHICS

In 1980, Arizona's population was 74.5 percent White and 25.5 percent minority: 16.2 percent Hispanic, 5.6 percent Native American, 2.7 percent Black, and 0.8 percent Asian. Minorities comprised only 12.5 percent of the state universities enrollment and 20.3 percent of the community college enrollment in 1986. Exact figures on high school graduation by ethnicity are unavailable, but closest estimates would suggest that of a cohort of ninth graders in 1984, 68 percent of

the non-minority students graduated in 1987 while 57 percent of the minority students graduated (Bartrum, 1988). In other words, a great number of our students, especially minorities, choose alternate pathways. Many do not view our current education system as meeting their needs or pertinent to their life goals.

The American Indian and Hispanic populations of Arizona are projected to nearly double by the year 2000. This expansion will be in the school age population. Arizona's entire education system must serve these populations more effectively than in the past if the state is to realize equity and continue its economic growth.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFLUENCES OF COMMUNITY

In most minority and low socioeconomic communities, college graduates, and to some degree high school graduates, are not common. Adults are employed mainly in blue collar and unskilled occupations. Although seasonal, cyclical, and declining industries, such as mining, provide employment, the nature of these industries results in greater periods of unemployment for large numbers of this population. As is well known, high schools in many low socioeconomic neighborhoods have higher dropout rates and higher minority enrollment. In a report analyzing the Stanford Achievement Test scores of ninth through twelfth grade students in Arizona, it was found that schools with high percentage minority enrollments had lower basic skills achievement scores than did other schools (Cotera, 1988). Adequate academic preparation for a college education is the exception rather than the rule in these schools.

For those students who do manage to complete successfully a college preparatory track in high school and who have not been discouraged from their educational goal by peer pressure or family obligations, receiving accurate and timely information about college is critical. Typically, information regarding college programs, admission procedures and requirements, financial aid application procedures and deadlines is handled by high school counselors and the recruitment/outreach efforts of the admissions and financial aid personnel of the universities. The student who is an outstanding athlete or has superior academic or other talent will receive information about university opportunities and scholarships.

The students who get lost in the process are those of average to above average academic ability, who are not "outstanding", and who do not have the initiative, self confidence, or knowledge of the system to seek out the information they need. For these students, even one supportive, encouraging adult can make the difference between seeking out college information or choosing another direction. Since the student's goals and the family are the two most influential reasons given by students for college attendance, informing all high school students and their families about college opportunities is imperative.

Relying on traditional methods of recruitment techniques may fail to access the most effective avenues of communication in minority and low socioeconomic neighborhoods. Presentations and participation in the typical Hispanic tardeada or the Native American pow wow, for example, could provide meaningful information to a population who currently may not be effectively reached. The fact that more

minorities attend the community colleges suggests that the "community" involvement of the college, in addition to the lower cost and lower admission requirements, make these institutions much more accessible for this population.

FINANCIAL AID APPLICATION

For those students who get as far in the process as obtaining the financial aid applications, the complexity of the forms is a major potential barrier to pursuing any type of postsecondary education. For example, the following is excerpted from the instructions for completing the College Scholarship Service Financial Aid Form (FAF). (Completion of this form (or the alternate ACT form) is required of all students seeking financial aid.)

> WARNING: It is important that you fill out this form accurately, even though it may be difficult and time-consuming. COMPLETING THE FORM INCORRECTLY WILL CAUSE YOU SERIOUS PROBLEMS (p.1).

On page three of the instructions, the following complex language is presented:

> If you are divorced, separated, or widowed, answer questions 18 and 19 only about you, the student (not your spouse). 18. Check "yes" if you (or your spouse) are classified as a dislocated worker....(FAF, 1988-89)

Both the FAF and ACT (The American College Testing Program) forms will probably intimidate <u>any</u> applicant, let alone parents with limited reading and mathematics skills, or " new from high school" students. The mathematics calculations required to compute income and assets can be extremely confounding for people who are not required to complete income tax returns.

One state university director of financial aid stated that the required federal financial aid application was not only "very complex and difficult" but it also is a "potential barrier" to pursuing a college degree. The director went on to state, "In addition to the completion of this form, many other documents are required by the parents and the students. Although [our] office attempts to provide many presentations and seminars in helping students and parents to complete these forms, it is believed to be a difficult process particularly if parents have not gone to college and do not understand many of the questions that relate to their own tax returns or other financial terms."

FINANCIAL AID OFFICES

All three state universities offer counseling assistance, workshops, and helpful information by telephone, but those that receive this help usually have already accessed the system in some way. It is often difficult for those of us who are involved with universities on a daily basis to realize what foreign and intimidating institutions they are to a large segment of our society. It is difficult to ask for help when you are not sufficiently familiar with the terminology to phrase a question or knowledgeable enough about the system to seek out the appropriate office or person.

The financial aid offices target institutional aid resources such as scholarships, Regents' tuition waivers, and special need waivers toward minority and other high-need students. They attempt to provide as much gift aid during the first two years as possible for these students. Federal guidelines

prohibit differential packaging for varying classes of students, so financial aid personnel cannot target special groups with the federal financial aid programs. As one director of financial aid stated, "There are never enough gift aid funds (grants and scholarships) to meet the documented financial need of our aid applicants, despite our policy of attempting to meet half of the student's need with gift aid."

INDEBTEDNESS: LOANS

In 1986-87 more than sixty percent of all need-based financial aid was in the form of loans. For undergraduate Arizona students dependent on loans, after four years of college, the average indebtedness is approximately $9,000. A five-year completion rate, which is increasingly the norm, raises that indebtedness to $12,000. Assuming an average starting salary after graduation of $19,000 and a loan indebtedness of $12,000, the monthly loan repayment would be about $150 a month for ten years (loan consolidation would lower the monthly payments, but prolong the debt). With a net income of about $1,200 per month, the graduate would have about $1,050 for living expenses. Minority concerns about incurring substantial indebtedness is realistic given the fact that the ACT alumni survey (Church, 1988) showed that minority alumni earn less than the non-minority alumni. The financial prospects of this degree of indebtedness will likely discourage most students from poor and minority populations. Also, the widely publicized default rates can be a disincentive for these students. Proposed legislation to make colleges more responsible for reducing student loan defaults may have an adverse impact on the populations most in need.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF PERSISTENCE

It is generally accepted that withdrawal of students from higher education is highest within the first two years of college attendance. Although financial problems are consistently among the top three reasons given for leaving school, other factors often underlie withdrawal. Within the first year of attendance, students usually find out whether they "fit" academically, culturally, and socially in the institution. The strength of the commitment to the academic career goal and to the institution are severely tested. The degree of personal commitment to an academic or career goal is the single most important determinant of persistence in college (Cope and Hannah). Lack of money is a socially acceptable reason to discontinue attending school, regardless of the actual financial status of the student.

> Students often use the category of finances to describe their evaluation of the benefits of their experience relative to the cost of that experience. That is to say that student decisions to leave reflect not so much cost per se as it does the value of what they receive for that cost. Not surprisingly their notions of value are tied to the quality of their academic and social experiences in the college (Tinto, 1988).

Students who persist into the sophomore year have an increased probability of completing their degree. If they experience financial difficulties they find or increase work, take out more loans, stop-out to work full-time and return later, or reduce to part-time attendance. They make adjustments, but they persist. Surviving the first year is the first and crucial hurdle. Completing the degree

with manageable indebtedness is the next obstacle.

From a financial view, what can be done during that first year of attendance to enhance persistence? Studies have shown that direct involvement with the campus has a strong positive correlation with persistence. Funding a state work-study program in order to provide more work opportunities for greater numbers of students would reduce the loan indebtedness of students. Also, provision for loans that are prorated to the time of withdrawal would be less handicapping financially for students, especially those who may want to return to higher education at a later time. Financial difficulties affect the student, family, and the environment of the home. Placing counseling support services and financial aid offices in close proximity and having cooperative student referral between the offices could help students persist.

CONCLUSION

As it presently exists, the financial aid system in Arizona works best for those who manage to make effective contact with the university structure. Financial access now tends to preserve the status quo and by and large the universities have been comfortable with the status quo. We have been content to educate those students most like ourselves. Unless changes are made in access to the state universities, the current system will continue to rigidify the stratification which exists in our society. In an address to state educators in April, Harold Hodgkinson stressed that Arizona is a state of extremes, in terms of population density, age, wealth, and educational attainment. Arizona has many students who complete graduate school and many students who do not graduate from high school. If a two-tiered society is not desired in this state, immediate action must be taken to insure access to our universities for a much greater percentage of our population.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The state should develop a financial assistance program for resident students with financial need in which loan indebtedness is kept to a minimum. Programs which should be considered by the state include:

1. A combination of state grant, institutional work-study, and small federal loan. This plan would focus grants and work aid during the freshman and sophomore years and limit the amount of loans needed to complete a baccalaureate degree to no more than $5,000.

2. A scholarship loan program. This plan would offer state funded scholarships to prepare for career employment which become loans only if the recipient fails to meet the employment or service criteria of the program.

3. A loan forgiveness program. The state would forgive or repay loans in exchange for service in an occupation which the state has determined as critical.

- Institutions should actively seek additional private funding for scholarships.

- The Arizona Board of Regents should continue its tuition/fee waiver program.

APPENDIX

TYPES OF AID

College Work-Study Program (CWS)--students with financial need are eligible for jobs as part of their financial aid package. Jobs can be on-campus or off-campus in public or non-profit agencies. The amount a student can earn depends on financial need and the amount of money the institution has available. Federal funds cover 80 percent of the wages and the institution provides the remainder. Created by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

Loans for Parents--parents may borrow $4,000 per year to pay the expected family contribution determined by a need analysis. The amount borrowed in any one year cannot exceed educational costs. The interest rate is the same as that for Supplemental Loans for Students. Repayment of these loans must begin 60 days after the proceeds are received. Parents must pass a credit check which may disallow the neediest parents.

Native American Grants--aid controlled by the Indian tribes. In 1983-84 the average award was $2,650.

Carl D. Perkins National Direct Student Loan (Perkins)-- formerly National Direct/Defense Loan (NDSL)--low interest loan (currently 5 percent) based on financial need with priority given to students with exceptional need. This loan is administered by the institution; it is the institution which determines the amount of the loan within federally set limits. The cumulative limits are $4,500 during the freshman and sophomore years, and $9,000 for the junior and senior years. Repayment begins six months after graduation (or cessation of attendance) with up to 10 years to pay. These loans are eligible for inclusion in loan consolidation. Deferment or partial cancellation of the loan is possible if the student enters specified types of service after school.

Pell Grants (Basic Educational Opportunity Grant)--provide grants to qualified undergraduate students based on financial need which are determined by use of a formula calculating income, assets, etc. This program was created by the 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act as a grant entitlement program available to every eligible student for use at any postsecondary institution. No other federal aid is awarded without considering the student's eligibility for a Pell Grant.

Private Scholarships--external sources such as civic groups, businesses, industry, or individuals contribute funds for students. The university or the donor selects the recipients. Awards range form $50 to $2,500 for the academic year.

Regents' tuition/fee waivers--waives fees for resident students and tuition for non-resident students. Fifty percent of the awards must go to students with documented financial need. ABOR has increased these waivers by 25 percent since 1986.

Stafford Student Loans--formerly Guaranteed Student Loan (GSL)--loans at below market interest rates (currently 8 percent) which are free from interest charges while a student is enrolled in an educational program. They are based on financial need. The loan is made to the student but the dependent student's family income, assets, and expenses are subject to a need analysis to determine eligibility. Maximum yearly loans for

freshmen and sophomores is $2,625 per year and $4,000 per year for upper-level undergraduates. A total of $17,250 is allowed for undergraduate study. To be eligible a student must be enrolled at least half time, have no outstanding debt from a previous student-loan default, pay a 5 percent origination fee, make satisfactory academic progress, and be a U.S. citizen or permanent resident alien. These loans are eligible for inclusion in loan consolidation. Stafford Loans is the single largest federal aid program.

State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG)--provides assistance to students with financial need on a 50-50 cost-sharing basis between federal and state governments. The states determine specific dollar amounts and administer the funds.

Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG)--provides grants to assist undergraduate students with exceptional financial need. Grants range from $200 to $2,000 for the academic year. It is available for full and part-time students who must make satisfactory progress.

Supplemental Loans for Students--allows independent undergraduate students to borrow up to $4,000 per year (total of $20,000). The interest rate is variable based on the one-year Treasury bill rate plus 3.75 percent, with a maximum of 12 percent. Repayment of principal plus interest begins as soon as the student leaves school or drops below full-time attendance.

Tuition set aside program--authorized by ABOR to provide funds for aid to students with financial need. By 1988-89, the value of the set aside program should be over $1 million.

REFERENCES

ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS. "Summary Statement on the Availability of Financial Aid for Arizona Resident Undergraduates." Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents, December 2, 1987.

ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS. "Summary of Recent Board Actions on Student Financial Aid." Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents, December 1, 1987.

ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS. "Minority Recruitment and Retention Report." Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents, December 4, 1987.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY. "Perspectives, Student Affairs Research and Evaluation Highlights." Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, 1988.

ASTIN, A.
THE AMERICAN FRESHMAN. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA. 1987.

BARTRUM, J. and GEBEL, M.
Arizona Environmental Scan.
Tempe: Arizona State University, Office of Institutional Analysis, February 1988.

BAUM, SANDY and SCHWARTZ, SAUL.
The Impact of Student Loans on Borrowers: Consumption Patterns and Attitudes Towards Repayment.
New England Student Loan Survey.
Boston: Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Corporation, January 1988.

BROWN, KENNETH G.
"Dropout Rates: A Longitudinal Analysis of Student Loan Users Compared with Users of Other Forms of Financial

Assistance." May 1980. ERIC Document ED 189 956.
CAPITAL IDEAS, "College Savings and Prepayment Plans." January 1988, 2(3 & 4), pp. 1-14.

CARROLL, ALAN AND DAVIS, GEORGE H.
"Productivity and Performance Measures of 26 Universities in 12 States.
" Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. July 1988.

CHURCH, KATHLEEN.
"ACT Alumni Survey." Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. June 1988.

COPE, R.G. and HANNAH, W.
Revolving College Doors: The Causes and Consequences of Dropping Out, Stopping Out, and Transferring. New York: Wiley, 1975.

COTERA, AUGUSTUS S.
"Survey of Factors of Student Access and Persistence in the Arizona Universities." Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. May 1988.

COTERA, AUGUSTUS S.
"Academic Preparation of HIgh School Students in Arizona." Phoenix: Arizona Board of Regents' Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency and Competitiveness. May 1987.

CORDES, COLLEEN, LEATHERMAN, COURTNEY, MCDONALD, KIM, and WHEELER, DAVID L.
"Reagan Seeks a Record $8.
8-Billion for Aid to Students; $9.
2-Billion Would Go to University R&D, Up 13 Pct." The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 24, 1988, 34(24), pp. A23-26.

DEFRATES, BRUCE.
"Northern Arizona University Office of Student Financial Aid Annual Report."
Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, October 1987.

EDWARDS, FLORA M.
The Chronicle of Higher Education"Piecemeal Solutions Won't Reduce the Default Rate on Guaranteed Loans." January 6, 1988, 34(17), pp. A44.

ERBSCHLOE, ROSS.
"Student Financial Aid in Arizona Postsecondary Schools, 1985-1986."
Phoenix: Arizona Commission for Postsecondary Education.

ERBSCHLOE, ROSS.
"Financial Aid in Arizona Postsecondary Educational Institutions for 1986-1987."
Phoenix: Arizona Commission for Postsecondary Education.

FENSKE, ROBERT H.
and HUFF, ROBERT P.
Handbook of Student Financial Aid, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983.

FORUM FOR COLLEGE FINANCING ALTERNATIVES.
"College Savings and Prepayment Plans."
Capital Ideas, January, 1988, 2(3&4), pp. 1-14.

HESS, GEORGE G.
"Financial-aid System Penalizes Savers,"
The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 10, 1988, 34(22), pp. B5.

HODGKINSON, HAROLD L.
Arizona: The State and Its Educational System, Washington, D.C.: The Institute

for Educational Leadership, Inc., April 1988.

JASCHIK, SCOTT.
"Governors Caution U.S. Against 'Pre-empting' Savings' Efforts." The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 2, 1988, 34(25), pp. A17-18.

JASCHIK, SCOTT.
"Delay in IRS Ruling Holds Up States' Prepaid-Tuition Plans." The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 2, 1988,34(25), pp. A17-18.

KORB, ROSLYN; SCHANTZ, NANCY; STOWE, PETER; AND ZIMBLER, LINDA. Undergraduate Financing of Postsecondary Education: A Report of the 1987 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, May 1988.

KREFETZ, GERALD.
How to Pay for Your Children's College Education. New York: The College Board, 1988.

LEE, VALERIE.
Access to Higher Education: The Experience of Blacks, Hispanics and Low Socio-economic Status Whites, Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, May 1985.

LENTH, CHARLES S.
Federal Student Aid Programs in the West: Funding and Distribution. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, May 1985.

MURDOCK, TULLISSE ANTOINETTE. The Effect of Financial Aid on Persistence in American Higher Education. An unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Arizona, 1986.

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT. U.S. Department of Education.
Bulletin OERI "The Effects of Grants on College Persistence." March 1987.

OBGU, JOHN U.
"Human Intelligence Testing: A Cultural-Ecological Perspective," National Forum. 68(2), pp. 23-29.

OLIVAS, MICHAEL A.
"Financial Aid Packaging Policies," Journal of Higher Education, July/August 1985, 56(4), pp. 462-475.

OLIVAS, MICHAEL A."Financial Aid and Self-Reports by Disadvantaged Students: The Importance of Being Earnest," Research in Higher Education, 1986, 25(3), pp. 245-253.

OLIVAS, MICHAEL A. "The Retreat from Access," ACADEME, November-December 1986, 72(6), pp. 16-18.

OLIVAS, MICHAEL A.
"Federal Higher Education Policy: The Case of Hispanics," Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, Fall 1982, 4(3), pp. 301-310.

REEHER, KENNETH R. and DAVIS, JERRY S.
19th Annual Survey Report, 1987-88 Academic Year, National Association of State Scholarship & Grant Programs(NASSGP), January 1988.

RICHARDSON, RICHARD C., JR.
"Three Categories of Minority Students." Presentation at Arizona State University, April 1988.

SHEARER, LLOYD.
"College Costs," Parade Magazine, March 20, 1988, p.12.

STAMPEN, JACOB O.
Student Aid and Public Higher Education: Recent Changes. Washington D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities. March 1985.

STUDENT AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF THE ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS. Financial Aid Report to the Board of Regents Finance Committee, September 3, 1987.

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID TASK FORCE.
"Arizona Financial Aid Trust, A Preliminary Report from The Arizona Board of Regents' Student Financial Aid Task Force," January 12, 1988.

THE COLLEGE BOARD.
Update--Trends in Student Aid: 1980 to 1987. Washington, D.C.: The College Board, November 1987.

TINTO, VINCENT.
"The Principles of Effective Retention." Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Higher Education, March 9, 1988, Washington D. C.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON.
"The Madison Plan," Madison, Wisconsin: Office of the Chancellor, February 9, 1988.

WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.
From Minority to Majority. Boulder, Colorado, September 1987.

WILSON, ROBIN.
"For-Profit Trade Schools Defraud Students and Waste Federal Student-Aid Money, Bennett Charges in Scathing Report," The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 17, 1988, 34(23), pp. 1,A21.

TABLES

TABLE 1

STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE - ACTIVITY REPORT - 1986-87

TYPE AID	ASU RECIPIENTS	ASU AMOUNT DISBURSED	NAU RECIPIENTS	NAU AMOUNT DISBURSED	UA RECIPIENTS	UA AMOUNT DISBURSED
I. GIFT AID						
SCHOLARSHIPS						
UNIVERSITY WAIVERS	4,086	7,636,382	2,787	2,609,636	....not available.....	
INST/PRIVATE SCHOLARSHIPS	4,434	5,023,628	1,234	852,586	....not available.....	
TOTAL SCHOLARSHIPS	7,235*	12,660,010	4,021*	3,462,222	5,945*	7,443,799
GRANTS						
PELL	5,248	7,389,721	2,655	3,876,144	2,890	4,015,029
SEOG	1,636	1,595,805	405	303,499	197	292,845
SSIG	722	593,810	243	217,116	324	410,058
UNIVERSITY	656	340,175	162	117,409		
NATIVE AMERICAN	191	638,201	671	1,535,912	130	193,025
VETERANS BENEFITS	832	2,502,650	437	1,095,967		
TOTAL GRANTS	7,019*	13,060,362	4,573*	7,146,047	10,170*	4,910,957
TOTAL GIFT AID ($48,683,397 grand total)	14,254*	25,720,372	8,594*	10,608,269	16,115*	12,354,756
II. SELF-HELP AID						
LOANS						
STAFFORD (GSL)	8,149	20,712,876	2,585	5,289,758	4,885	13,341,618
PERKINS (NDSL)	1,783	2,377,492	602	768,962	944	1,677,330
PLUS	198	524,329	79	188,430	175	397,315
OTHER**	1,943	674,803	355	1,219,014	4,288	2,561,379
TOTAL LOANS	8,519*	23,100,061	3,621*	7,466,164	10,292*	17,977,642
EMPLOYMENT						
COLLEGE WORK STUDY	765	1,108,338	629	596,095	343	424,972
HOURLY, PART-TIME	3,565	4,667,441	2,578	2,352,349		
ASSISTANTSHIPS	1,821	11,351,963	370	1,666,670	....not available.....	
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT	5,983*	17,127,742	3,577	4,615,114	10,429*	25,830,103
TOTAL SELF-HELP AID ($96,116,826 grand total)	14,502*	40,227,803	7,198*	12,081,278	20,721*	43,807,745
TOTAL SELF-HELP AID ($144,800,223 grand total)	20,135	65,948,175	7,418	22,650,845	18,252	56,162,501

* Reflects duplication

** Other loans include Health Professions Student Loan Programs, Health Education Assistance Loan Program (HEAL), Nursing Loan Program, and Alaska Loans.

Source: Arizona Commission for Postsecondary Education Report of Financial Aid in Arizona Postsecondary Educational Institutions for 1986-1987. Summary statement on the availability of financial aid for Arizona resident undergraduates, Arizona Board of Regents, December 2, 1987.

TABLE 2

FINANCIAL AID RECIPIENTS/AWARDS* BY TYPE, FALL 1986, SPRING 1987, SUMMER 1987

	TOTAL MALE	TOTAL FEMALE	UNDERGRADUATE NON-MINORITY	HISP	BLACK	AM IN	ASIAN	GRADUATE NON-MINORITY	HISP	BLACK	AM IN	ASIAN
SCHOLARSHIPS												
ASU	3108	3744	3780	616	280	188	159	1590	116	51	33	39
NAU**	2721	3596	4867	448	287	656	59	not available				
UA	1460	1769	2038	350	102	147	87	399	47	10	26	23
GRANTS												
ASU	3727	3084	5117	584	336	300	226	188	14	11	36	2
NAU	2363	3115	3188	509	179	1532	70	not available				
UA	1861	2147	2842	696	137	130	161	25	12	1	1	3
LOANS												
ASU	4663	4069	6292	577	348	147	212	1018	63	11	10	24
NAU	2698	2858	4650	453	137	245	69	not available				
UA	3055	2589	4102	576	184	49	164	922	66	20	12	29
EMPLOYMENT												
ASU	2556	2644	2961	296	142	72	116	1466	50	31	11	55
NAU	1804	2242	3336	324	93	232	61	not available				
UA***	166	202	253	65	19	8	10	10	1	0	0	2
UNDUPLICATED RECIPIENTS												
ASU	8740	8601	11591	1140	570	388	426	2818	182	79	69	78
NAU	3255	3891	5609	495	156	810	76	not available				
UA	not available											

* ASU and NAU data reflect number of recipients; UA data reflect number of awards.

** Academic year only; includes graduate students.

*** It appears this figure does not include graduate assistants and associates.

SOURCE: Arizona Board of Regents Minority Recruitment and Retention Report, December 4, 1987.

TABLE 3
ESTIMATED GRANT DOLLARS TO UNDERGRADUATES IN 1987-88
PER UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT, ARIZONA AND COMPARABLE STATES*

STATE/RANKING**	NEED-BASED AID TO UNDERGRADUATES	STATE/RANKING	UNDERGRADUATE GRANT AID	STATE/RANKING	FALL 1985 UNDERGRADUATES
9. IOWA	$208	8. IOWA	$236	18. ARIZONA	179,075
19. OREGON	94	19. COLORADO	139	24. IOWA	126,044
21. OKLAHOMA	83	20. OKLAHOMA	129	25. OKLAHOMA	125,833
22. COLORADO	78	27. OREGON	94	26. COLORADO	119,737
41. ARIZONA	18	43. ARIZONA	18	29. OREGON	107,371
national average	154	national average	188	national average	180,721

TOTAL STATE GRANTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF APPROPRIATIONS OF STATE TAX FUNDS
FOR OPERATING EXPENSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN 1987-88,
ARIZONA AND COMPARABLE STATES*

STATE/RANKING	PERCENT	STATE/RANKING	TOTAL STATE GRANT APPROPRIATIONS	STATE/RANKING	TOTAL STATE TAX FUNDS FOR HIGHER ED.
9. IOWA	7.07%	15. IOWA	$31,231,000	25. ARIZONA	$491,912,000
15. OKLAHOMA	4.64%	19. COLORADO	18,556,000	26. IOWA	441,458,000
18. COLORADO	4.21%	20. OKLAHOMA	17,919,000	27. COLORADO	441,021,000
23. OREGON	2.89%	28. OREGON	10,121,000	29. OKLAHOMA	386,266,000
39. ARIZONA	.66%	35. ARIZONA	3,254,000	32. OREGON	349,939,000
national average	5.20%	national average	35,437,000	national average	680,841,000

* Comparability based on state population, tax funds, and appropriations to higher education

** Number indicates ranking in the fifty states

SOURCE: Reeher, K. R. and Davis, J. S. 19th. Annual Survey Report, 1987-88 Academic Year. National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs, January 1988.

TABLE 4
EEC TASK FORCE SURVEY OF PRODUCTIVITY AND PERFORMANCE
FISCAL YEAR 1988

UNIVERSITY	ENROLLMENT	EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY	STATE FUNDED WAIVERS/SCHOL	STATE APPROPRIATED FIN. AID PAYMENTS	FEDERAL GRANTS PAYMENTS
ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY	41,169	$199,144,800	$10,587,500	$ 211,100	$12,541,100
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY	38,280	178,586,730	120,045	2,739,533	7,238,989
UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	32,857	258,087,400*	10,159,700	173,900	4,916,000
UNIVERSITY OF UTAH	24,134	149,677,500	4,323,600	386,000	5,500,000
NORTH TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY	22,380	101,155,149	2,450,000	1,200,000	3,000,000
UNIVERSITY OF OREGON	17,698	88,422,632	675,229	1,400,000	11,000,000
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY	15,199	138,777,286	537,245	1,430,000	10,000,000
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS EL PASO	14,053	63,686,263	55,733	1,360,473	3,273,500
NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY	13,445	66,903,300	3,274,200	176,500	5,235,500
WEBER STATE UNIVERSITY	12,002	40,634,200	857,900	180,259	1,254,101
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY	9,878	43,123,100	1,045,530	275,000	5,300,000
UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO	9,032	69,737,600	NA	145,510	3,300,000
NORTHERN COLORADO UNIVERSITY	8,675	39,188,739	NA	2,449,458	2,407,571
IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY	7,358	43,887,000	1,306,400	45,500	9,500,000

*Includes College of Medicine

NA=not available

TABLE 5

STATE FUNDED INSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARSHIPS AND WAIVERS, 1986-87

Type	ASU Number	Amount	Percent	NAU Number	Amount	Percent	Number	Amount	Percent
ACADEMIC	2589	$4,054,000	47%	507	$ 0575,633	21%	2485	$3,281,052	38%
ATHLETIC	336	$1,168,000	14%	364	$ 609,630	22%	326	$ 935,642	11%
FACULTY/STAFF DEFENDENT WAIVERS	1418	$1,004,000	12%	855	$ 476,106	%17	2011	$1,261,992	15%
OTHER:	883	$2,368,100	28%	625	$1,062,803	%39	1094	$3,142,720	37%
Special Need Waivers Activity Waivers Graduate Assistantships W.I.C.H.E. Sponsored Projects etc.									

* average headcount per semester for Fiscal Year 1987

** indicate amounts that represent budget funding revenue only

SOURCE: Arizona State University, Northern Arizona University, and University of Arizona Legislative Budget Requests for 1989